

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
October 16, 2014**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Scott Waggoner, Mike Nichols

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** David Scott Meade, Kevin Sutton

**STAFF PRESENT:** Gary Lee, Senior Planner

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Susan Trapp, Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Joe Palmquist at 7:02 p.m.

**MINUTES**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 18, 2014 MEETING. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

**PROJECT REVIEW**

**LAND-2013-01332, 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue Senior Housing**

**Description:** 74 units of affordable senior housing with a mix of studio, 1 & 2 bedroom units

**Location:** 8550 160<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Architect:** Valerie Thiel *with* Sage Architectural Alliance

**Applicant:** Dan Landes *with* Shelter Resources, Inc.

**Prior Review Dates:** 10/03/13 & 11/21/13

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or [glee@redmond.gov](mailto:glee@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lee noted that this was the final review of the Senior Housing Project, which has been before the DRB two times before. At the last meeting, the Board said this project was ready for approval. Mr. Lee had only one condition for approval regarding the tower element and the pattern of mullions on it, which has a brickwork pattern. He suggested a vertical pattern instead.

Architect Valerie Thiel spoke to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. She said she agreed with Mr. Lee's assessment that the tower element pattern should be vertical. Other changes have been made to the project, including working with traffic and Fire Department concerns to resolve a drop-off area along the street in front of the project. The building has 75 units of affordable senior housing, with common spaces between the units and a clinic called the PACE Center, which stands for Program for All-inclusive Care for the Elderly. The housing units have fiber cement siding. There is underground parking provided. A large existing tree on the corner of the project has been removed, at the request of the City. A smaller deciduous tree has been put in its place. The outdoor plaza has been developed with low retaining walls, and there are doors from the inside that open onto it. The plaza is about eighteen inches above the level of the pedestrian path. The laundry room has now been located in this area so the building has a better presence along the pedestrian path with two large windows and an awning.

The east side of the building is unchanged. The accent color is a shade of green that provides a revealing element in the massing. The reddish mullion on the south end is now a medium bronze color. The elevator lobby has been pulled forward to give the accent color a three-dimensional aspect. The north end is unchanged. There is a cluster of evergreen trees that has been retained, as well as street trees. The entrance to the municipal center has not been changed.

Mr. Krueger asked the applicant to go through the color board and materials. Ms. Thiel showed the brick material to the DRB, which is similar to brick used on the library nearby. The stucco used on the project will have a color that blends into the base color of the building. The north and south wing have a hardy board panel exterior, with a lighter color at the top. They are vertical boards, which provide a receding effect. The applicant showed the medium bronze of the mullions. The smaller wall around the plaza has a concrete base, which is a light color to blend in with the rest of the project.

**COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the pre-cast concrete on the wall. The applicant said it would not be painted, but would be similar to the base of the building. Mr. Nichols clarified that the rendering showed a lighter cream color for that concrete.
- The applicant said the concrete would be a lighter, architectural concrete. Mr. Nichols confirmed that it would not be gray, but a lighter color.
- Mr. Nichols said that beyond that color issue with the concrete, he had no questions or concerns.

Mr. Krueger:

- Said the project was great. Mr. Krueger liked what the applicant had done on the south end of the project, especially the windows and detailed added. He liked the concrete base of the plaza wall.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed that the change Mr. Lee had asked for would be employed on the project to create vertical reveals.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said he may have missed the second meeting on this project, but said the applicant had come a long way since the first meeting. Mr. Waggoner said the driveway on the north side of the building was on the front side originally, and the new design is much improved to avoid any sharp turns.
- Overall, Mr. Waggoner was happy with the project and said the landscaping updates and concrete walls have been improved.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Said he also missed the second pre-application for this project, but said that this project has come around to be a great project.
- Mr. Palmquist asked for a motion to approve the project.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE PROJECT LAND-2013-01332, 160<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE SENIOR HOUSING, WITH THE STANDARD CONDITIONS REGARDING COLORS AND MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES AS WELL, AS THE REQUIREMENT STIPULATED BY STAFF ABOUT THE GREEN TOWER SHOULD BE CLAD WITH VERTICALLY-ORIENTED SIDING MATERIAL. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**LAND-2014-01563, The Village (aka Monroe Property)**

**Description:** Development of a five-story, 96 unit multi-family residential building with associated parking to accommodate 117 parking stalls

**Location:** 8336 & 8360 165<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and 8357 166<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Architect:** Kent Smutny *with* Veer Architecture

**Applicant:** Gary Noyes *with* Northwest Pacific Development, LLC

**Prior Review Date:** 09/04/14

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or [glee@redmond.gov](mailto:glee@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lee said this was the second pre-application meeting for this project. At the previous meeting, the applicant presented three cladding schemes, A, B, and C, as alternatives for this development. The Board pointed the applicant toward scheme C, which has now been developed in much more detail. Mr. Lee said this project was ready for submission of an application, but he wanted the Board's opinion on that matter.

Architect Ken Smutny presented to the DRB on behalf of the applicant. He said the project appears to be ready for approval, in his estimation. The southwest corner has been developed to contrast with the rest of the building. The corner bay is the main entry into the lobby of the building, and it is punctuated with materials such as two stories of brick. The remainder of the building will have fiber cement siding materials. At the corner, the applicant will use a contrasting design of plank-type panels and reveals. The bays across 165<sup>th</sup> now have varying heights, in response to a DRB request for modulation in this element of the project. The top floor, or fifth floor, has been set off as a cap to the building with the use of a contrasting color and a different treatment of the fiber cement siding.

The main outdoor common space, on the south side of the building, is adjacent to the Core 83 project just to the south. The space has been broken up according to different functions. There is a more active area just outside the fitness room of the project. In the interior of the building, there are more passive functions. There is an outdoor covered seating area just off the main lobby. The entire area will be screened with a variety of planters and trellis elements. On the north side of the building, previously, there was one continuous elevation. The DRB had noted at the last meeting that there were setback requirements regarding façade length. So, the applicant has now broken up this elevation to create the look of two buildings using bays with different heights. On the 166<sup>th</sup> elevation, the towers have been treated to look like the towers on the main entry side on 165<sup>th</sup>. This treatment includes a brick base and contrasting fiber cement siding on the corner bays. The street side of the building has been further modulated with decks. There will be two street-related units that will have entry doors off the sidewalk on 166<sup>th</sup>.

In the last meeting, the DRB had some questions about the relationship between this project and the Core 83 building to the south. There is about 23 feet between the two buildings, and the center space between them is about 16 feet. On the Core 83 side, the landscaping will provide some screening between the two buildings. Fire access will be provided in this area as well. The project relates to the surrounding buildings, and the niches on the project's north side and south end corner help to break up the L-shaped massing to create the look of two separate buildings. The applicant showed a detailed image of the niches. The units on the left side of the project will look into a landscaped place with planters. The windows will open into the corridor that connects the two wings of the building. A contrasting color has been provided on the back face of the niche to further emphasize the break in the building. The north elevation has been treated in the same way with planters creating a landscape break in that niche. Through use of color, the landscaping has been emphasized even further.

Green space has been provided around the building, which includes a substantial amount of landscaping along 165<sup>th</sup>. There will be space between the units on that side of the building and the sidewalks on that street. The same treatment will occur along 166<sup>th</sup>, where there are two units that have walkways up to porches off the sidewalk. The colors and materials include a blended-tone brick at the base and a darker earth tone on the body of the building. Lighter colors have been used in the bays themselves with more of a sand color on the fifth floor of the building. Another alternative for colors has been provided, at staff's suggestion, to deal with the contrast of colors considered at the top of the building. The bays have a more muted arrangement and are a little darker. The top floor would be more of a neutral, gray color.

The lighting for the project includes the use of two different lights in the landscape areas, including directional up-lights for larger plant materials and general up-lighting as well. The main entry of the building includes decorative sconces and can lights in the awnings. There are step lights in the stairs. Decorative post lights will be used at the corners of the porches that face the street. The post lights would also occur within the outdoor common space as well. The units would have a more simplified light fixture at each deck or Juliet balcony. The top floor common space will have a smaller-scale version of the decorative fixtures used at the main entry of the building. The applicant showed the DRB examples of each type of lighting described above. Wall lights will be placed on the sides of the bays that face the street. A decorative lighting fixture would be inset into the bricks themselves. The elevation on 165<sup>th</sup> would have a random pattern of accent lighting.

Jason Anderson with Design 2426 next spoke on behalf of the applicant regarding the landscaping of the project. The same plants used in the Core 83 project will be used on this project. The street trees along both sides of the streets will be the same species. The courtyards have been highlighted with some color

and some evergreen plantings. Per the Fire Department's request, on the south and east sides of the project, a hardy Kinnikinnick ground cover has been used to allow for better access. Also in connection to fire access, the trees on this project are slightly smaller in size compared to Core 83, where the trees are about eight feet wide and about sixteen to eighteen feet tall. The same native plants used in the Core 83 site have been used in the current project, including vine maples, cedars, cypress, winter creeper, azaleas, and rhododendrons. Mr. Smutny asked the DRB members for their input.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Waggoner:

- Said the project looked good. Mr. Waggoner liked how the different groupings of bay windows were articulated at different heights and widths to break up the massing.
- He liked the updated colors provided by the applicant rather than the yellowish colors of the original presentation. However, Mr. Waggoner said the original design had bay windows on the corner that really stood out a lot compared with the background color. He said these colors could be lightened a little bit to provide some contrast.
- Mr. Waggoner asked the wall light and if it would be located at the top or bottom of the walls. The applicant said it would be at the top, shining down, to avoid shining light up into the sky. The applicant said it would be a strip of lights shining down.
- Mr. Waggoner asked how the light fixture would be mounted. The applicant said fixture would be attached such that the light would be oriented towards the wall. Mr. Waggoner asked Mr. Lee if any site lighting issues would be triggered by this fixture.
- Mr. Lee asked how wide the lighting fixture would be. The applicant said it was a longer strip of lighting, perhaps 12 inches long and three to four inches wide. This light would be three stories up in the air, and the applicant was unsure if people could see it from below. Mr. Lee suggested that a night shot of that lighting should be provided at the next meeting. Mr. Waggoner agreed.
- Mr. Waggoner asked about the setback between this project and the Core 83 building. The applicant said the minimum setback for height and wall length would be employed. The space between the buildings is 22 feet, nine inches.
- Mr. Waggoner said the buildings were aligned very closely and asked if some awnings could be provided on the windows of the lower floor units to prevent people from looking in. Overall, he said the project has come a long way. He agreed with staff that this project was close to come back for approval.

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Was curious about the elevation on 166<sup>th</sup>, where it appeared it would be logical to extend the entry corridor east to create another residential entry and exit, rather than having the main entry on 165<sup>th</sup>. The applicant said the west side entry was developed for this site based on the Core 83 project, where pedestrian traffic would be going west.
- Mr. Krueger noted that there is still an entry on the southeast corner of Core 83. He noted that he missed the first pre-application on this project, but it felt like there was a lot of activity happening on 165<sup>th</sup>. But the project on that street side looks very utilitarian, and he asked if an entry or something at the pedestrian level could help add some enhancement.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the columns or posts on the balconies and what material they would be made from. The applicant said the decks would be wood construction, independently built, and bolted onto the building. The post at the corner of the balconies has been added because without it, the construction would be much more complicated and costly.
- The post would be a 6" x 6" material. Mr. Krueger said he would like to see that material at the next meeting, but said he was uncomfortable with the elevations where the posts were prominent. He understood the structural aspects for the posts, but he was not used to seeing them on street side elevations.
- Mr. Krueger agreed with Mr. Waggoner that the muted colors were more proper for the 165<sup>th</sup> elevation. He said the bay projections look best when combined into a larger mass. He noted that it would be a challenge to create a larger bay between the units, with regard to the individual unit layout.
- He said he had a personal problem with these types of bays, an opinion he also expressed on the Core 83 project. He suggested a change in color scheme to reduce the impact of the bays to blend

them more into the building. He suggested making some changes to the stairs used on the site. He said this elevation really stood out to him.

- Beyond that, Mr. Krueger said Scheme C looked good. He asked if the color scheme could be muted, but not too dark. He asked about the windows in the walls with the horizontal siding and if any trim would be added there. The applicant said trim was not in the design for the windows in the body of the building. The bays have windows with trim, however.
- Mr. Krueger confirmed that trim would be used on the upper floor windows. The applicant said this was a way to provide contrast between the bays, the top floor, and the body of the building. Mr. Krueger said the no-trim look appeared too flat to him.
- Mr. Krueger asked about the landscaping on the north side of the building, and if there was any way to soften the building on this side with additional plantings. The applicant said the sidewalk on this elevation is the exit path from the stairway to the street. West of that, there is plenty of room for landscape, but in the area Mr. Krueger is concerned about, there are some Code restrictions.
- Mr. Krueger said this went back to his comment about taking the entry off of 166<sup>th</sup> and how the Code would impact that. The applicant said the dimensions of the site demand that a stairway is placed on the north side of the building.

Mr. Nichols:

- Said he liked the second scheme of colors presented, which appeared more in line with what Mr. Lee was looking for. Mr. Nichols liked the use of the exterior lighting, which adds interest to the outside of the building.
- He asked about the landscaping between this project and the Core 83 building, which would be a well-shaded area. The applicant said the plantings should be fine, in that the area is wide enough to allow in a good amount of light in the summer. Reflective light off the buildings will help as well. The plants selected are native to the area and do well in sun and shade.
- Mr. Nichols said the distance between the buildings appears narrow, but if it meets Code, that was acceptable. He looked forward to seeing this project back for approval with response to some of the earlier comments of the DRB members.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about the 166<sup>th</sup> elevation, which he said has come a long way since its first iteration. In general, Mr. Palmquist liked how the project was coming together. However, he said the white towers on the project could be tied together better to give a top/middle/bottom rhythm to the building.
- Mr. Palmquist said the gray band element should be repeated between the clerestory windows and the windows at the top part of the project. This would emphasize the break between the top and middle of the building. He said the gray band could help the white elements pop and stand out.
- He liked the massing of the project and the fact that the brick element has been brought up to the second floor.
- Mr. Palmquist thought it was odd to have the lighter-colored windows in the brick of the second floor of the main tower. The applicant said it was a vinyl window, which does show up well in the brick. Mr. Palmquist said it was an interesting look, and might look good up higher on the project as well. He liked seeing the windows pop rather than seeing the joints in all the panels.
- Mr. Palmquist asked about hardy panel and how it would be applied to the project. The applicant said it would be a rain screen with reveals on the corners. The top floor would have battens applied to the hardy panel, popping out rather than pushing in.
- The applicant said the reveals would be an off-the-shelf system, most likely, but he has not reached that level of detail on the project. Mr. Palmquist would like to see an example of those reveals at the next meeting.
- Mr. Palmquist confirmed with the applicant that a white color on the project would be off-white, not the brighter white that shows up in the rendering. He said keeping lighter colors clean can be difficult on larger buildings.
- Overall, Mr. Palmquist liked the color scheme, especially the dark details and copings around the top of the roof and the eaves. He said the DRB would need more details on how the materials come together and what finishes would be applied. He asked the applicant to consider tying the white tower elements together a bit more and emphasizing the horizontal band between the clerestory windows.

- Mr. Lee asked Mr. Palmquist to clarify the banding he was concerned about. Mr. Palmquist used a laser pointer to emphasize the idea he had to create a top/middle/bottom language to the building. He did not want the upper windows to get lost in the design.
- Mr. Lee noted that Mr. Krueger had some different opinions about the trim around the windows. Mr. Palmquist said it would look too traditional if trim was added in the spots Mr. Krueger had pointed out. He said the applicant has struck a good balance between the textures and siding proposed. He said adding trim to all the windows would make it feel too busy.
- Mr. Waggoner echoed that thought, and noted that the vinyl windows would stand out by themselves and did not need any kind of trim.
- Mr. Palmquist said the trim should be used on the top windows by the towers. He said the side of the white elements that pop out from the building might need some vertical elements, but adding a lot of trim would be too much.
- Mr. Krueger said Mr. Palmquist was right about the windows. However, he noted there was a stark difference between having trim on the front windows but no trim on the back.
- Mr. Lee asked if this project could come back for approval. Mr. Krueger said it appeared ready. Mr. Waggoner said, with more details provided, the project was okay for approval. Mr. Palmquist said the project was developed enough to come back for approval.
- Mr. Nichols asked if the color scheme could be clarified, in that three DRB members liked the darker colors, but Mr. Palmquist liked the lighter colors. Mr. Palmquist said he could go either way. His main concern was to make sure the white color on the project would not be a true white.
- Mr. Nichols asked the applicant to bring in an elevation of the project relative to the Core 83 building as a way to compare colors and massing. Mr. Lee said he wanted to avoid the entire downtown becoming beige or yellow.
- Mr. Palmquist said the beige colors of this building go well together, and he liked the dark detailing around the project. He said that detailing provided enough balance, such that the building did not appear all beige. He did not mind the color scheme as a whole, though he would entertain other colors if they were presented. The DRB and the applicant thanked each other for their time.

## **PRE-APPLICATION**

### **LAND-2014-01226 The Carter**

**Description:** Construction of a 6-story mixed use building

**Location:** 7494-7500 159<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

**Applicant:** Kim Faust *with* Main Street Property Group, LLC

**Prior Review Date:** 05/01/14

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or [glee@redmond.gov](mailto:glee@redmond.gov)

Mr. Lee said that this was the second pre-application meeting on this project. The applicant is asking for administrative modification design flexibility, which would be a reduced setback on the south side. Before, the applicant had placed a niche in the building to break up the massing. Now, the applicant is considering some new ideas, which would provide some different design concepts for the building and the neighborhood overall. Mr. Lee said the project would be approved administratively at this meeting, but it would have to go to the Technical Committee next. The idea is to see if the DRB is amenable to this modification, and if not, what could be done to make that so. Mr. Lee said the applicant has provided a superior design, in staff's opinion, and the next step is to look for guidance from the DRB.

The applicant said the DRB last saw this project when the building was situated right in the middle of the site with standard 20-foot side setbacks on the north and south sides of the property. As the project has progressed, the applicant has refined the design. On the north side of the site, there is an opportunity to share the access easement for the fire lane. With that, the applicant could take the design guidelines and tailor them to this block, in general. The guidelines call for a 20-foot side setback within this area of Downtown Redmond, which is very reasonable as a rule of thumb. However, the applicant believes this rule is not as applicable on this particular site. Bear Creek Parkway runs to the north of it, and Leary runs to the south. The property is located on 159<sup>th</sup>. There is a 14-foot street improvement on either side of 159<sup>th</sup>, 14 feet on Bear Creek, and 30 feet on either side of Leary. Bear Creek is a bit of a gray area in that there is a lot of park land near it.

Previously, the site was designed with a 20-foot side setback, which creates a 40-foot separation between the buildings on the property and the trails to the east and vehicular access points to the site. The newly proposed scheme would consolidate the side setback areas and separate the functions, such that there would be a vehicular-only side to the project on the north. The south side setback, by moving the building 10 feet to the north, would grow about 10 feet. Instead of having two ambiguous spaces on either side of the property, the applicant could have a much greener and more pedestrian-oriented trail connection to the south side of the project. Both the north and south lot plats around this site have green areas on three sides. By increasing the south setback, an even greater mid-block connection to those green areas would be provided. The courtyard of the project connects to the trail, but with the proposed 30-foot pedestrian access easement to the trail on the south side, the connection could be even stronger and would tie into the main activity hub of the building. Moving the site 10 feet to the north has allowed for a bike storage area to be located, on grade, at the pedestrian access easement. The north side of the site would have a 20-foot side setback for vehicles only.

The argument that a full 40 feet of side setback on this site is necessary fades a bit, in the applicant's opinion, when the amount of green space relief is considered. The applicant showed some other sites in Seattle with smaller side setbacks, which can be successful. He noted that the new proposal for The Carter would bring the site right up to the trail and bring the trail into the project's property. Some residential terraces could be built above the trail, potentially. A bike storage and bike workshop area could be added. The building could be very rich and pedestrian-oriented. Inset ground lighting would help add to the pedestrian experience. Decorative concrete paving would help make the site appear more comfortable. The north side setback would be vehicular only, but would not be devoid of design intention. Some graphic elements have been suggested, and some wood lap siding could be added at the visitor parking stalls.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Nichols:

- Asked about the south elevation and what appears to be a mechanical screen or a green screen. The applicant said it would be a two-story bike storage area. A louvered system would be used, but some wire screening would be involved as well. Catenary lights would be provided above it.
- Mr. Nichols confirmed that the 30-foot sidewalk would be a plaza-type structure. Mr. Lee confirmed that this would be a pedestrian walkway going from the sidewalk to the trail. The applicant said the paving pattern has not yet been determined. Mr. Lee said this element was important because the applicant, voluntarily, was providing a pedestrian access to the trail.
- Mr. Nichols asked if the easement on the north side needed for this project has been agreed to. The applicant said that was the case. Mr. Nichols said that was all he was concerned about.

##### Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the north property, and if that property needed some modification on its setback. Mr. Krueger asked Mr. Lee if there would be a 30-foot separation between this building and the one to the north. Mr. Lee said the massing of a building dictates the setback. A narrower building would have a setback of less than 20 feet, but at the most, it would be 20 feet.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the building to the north could be built in such a way that the separation between it and this project would be 20 feet. The applicant said that would be the case, if it was at its absolute closest. Mr. Krueger was concerned about windows of units looking into each other.
- Mr. Krueger asked if the property owner to the north had a problem with the idea of reducing the setback. The applicant said the 20 feet between the buildings is considered shared vehicular access. The building to the north is simply running a business and has not done a new design for their building. The fundamental idea is that both buildings would share vehicular and fire access.
- The applicant said the neighboring building could gain 10 feet that they otherwise would not have by entering into this agreement with the applicant. Mr. Lee said that public notice would be made of the application, but there would be no public hearing. Once the preparation process is complete, a notice about the project would be sent to the public.
- Mr. Krueger said the project looks like a great way to provide more light at the end of the Carter Building as long as the people to the north who would be impacted are amenable with it.

Mr. Waggoner:

- Said the applicant's plan would really accentuate the building. Mr. Waggoner liked the public pathway and the plan to separate vehicles from pedestrians.
- Mr. Waggoner was supportive of the plan.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Agreed with his fellow DRB members and said this was a no-brainer to focus cars on one side and provide a wider connection between the street and the trail.
- Mr. Palmquist asked if a motion was needed. Mr. Nichols said he was supportive of the plan, in that it would create something special on this site.
- Mr. Lee said a motion was not needed. He queried the Board members and found they were all supportive of the idea to provide the applicant some administrative modification design flexibility.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:50 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).**

**November 20, 2014**  
**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

  
**RECORDING SECRETARY**